

REMARKS

Claims 9-24 are currently pending in the present application, none of which has been amended.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9-12, 14-20 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Guha* (US 6,539,373) in view of *Irwin* (US 6,052,683). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

Claim 9 (and similarly Claim 17) recites "means for constructing a search key." Specifically, a search key is constructed by "generating a full match search increment comprising the binary representation of a data string element, wherein said data string element includes a plurality of non-delimiters between a pair of delimiters" and by "concatenating a pattern search prefix to said full match search increment to form said search key, wherein said pattern search prefix is a cumulative pattern search result of all previous full match search increments."

On page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the generating portion of the claimed means for constructing a search key is disclosed by *Guha* in col. 7, line 59 to col. 8, line 22. Col. 7, line 59 to col. 8, line 22 are related to a hash table architecture as shown in Figure 3 of *Guha*. For example, col. 7, lines 59-62 disclose each entry in "hash table 204 also contain a secondary hash key 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322 that can be obtained by applying a secondary has function 304 to the item to be stored." However, none of above-mentioned items is related to the construction of a search key, as claimed. In fact, the only item in Figure 3 of *Guha* that can logically be construed as a search key is search term 301.

The Examiner continues to assert that the concatenating portion of the claimed means for constructing a search key is disclosed by *Guha* in col. 8, line 12 to col. 9, line 31. Since the premise of the claimed means for constructing a search key is to provide a search key; thus, the concatenating portion recites "concatenating a pattern search prefix to said full match search increment to form said search key." In contrast, col. 8, line 12 to col. 9, line 31 of *Guha* are

related to the determination of whether or not a particular item exists within master file 205, and the location of matches within various hash buckets, such as hash buckets 211-213, within hash table 204.

Claim 9 also recites "means for returning to said constructing a search key, in response to finding a matching pattern within said lookup table" and "means for utilizing the previous full match search result to process said data string, in response to not finding a matching pattern within said lookup table." Thus, according to the claimed invention, if a matching pattern is found within the lookup table, then a new search key is constructed; but if a matching pattern is not found within the lookup table, then the previous full match search result is used to process the data string.

On page 3 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed means for returning to said constructing a search key is disclosed by *Guha* in col. 9, lines 32-51, and that the claimed means for utilizing the previous full match search result to process said data string is also disclosed by *Guha* in col. 9, lines 32-51. According to the teachings of *Guha* in col. 9, lines 32-51, which can succinctly be viewed in Figure 5, there are two matching determinations, *i.e.*, blocks 506 and 508. In the first matching determination, the master file is consulted for matching hash bucket items when there is a match, as shown in block 507. In the second matching determination, the pointer is returned to the matching item where there is a match, as shown in block 510. It is clear that none of the above-mentioned results is analogous to "returning to said constructing a search key," as claimed. On the other hand, when there is no match, a negative result is returned, as depicted in block 509. Again, it is clear that such result is different from "utilizing the previous full match search result," as claimed.

As mentioned in the previous response, *Irwin* does not teach or suggest various features of the claimed invention either. Because the cited references, whether considered separately or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention, the § 103 rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 9-24 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 9 and 17 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 50-0563.

Respectfully submitted,



Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Cap. of Texas Hwy, suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS